Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/727,140   First Named Applicant: Juergen Heymann

Examiner: Bradford Fritz   ▪   Art Unit: 2442   ▪   Status of Application: Pending   ▪

Tentative Participants:

(1) Examiner Fritz   ▪   (2) Michael D. Van Loy   ▪

(3)_____   (4)_____

Proposed Date of Interview: Tuesday October 6, 2009   ▪   Proposed Time: 1:00 PM EDT▪(AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☑ Telephonic   (2) ☐ Personal   (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES   ☑ NO

If yes, provide brief description:_____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) § 103 ▪	All ▪	Flurry et al. ▪	☐	☐	☐
(2)_____	_____	_____	☐	☐	☐
(3)_____	_____	_____	☐	☐	☐
(4)_____	_____	_____	☐	☐	☐

☑ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Summary on attached continuation sheet (1)   ▪

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on __October 6, 2009__ ▪.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

[signature]

_____   _____

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature   Examiner/SPE Signature

Michael D. Van Loy   ▪

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

52,315   ▪

Registration Number, if applicable

Serial No.	:	10/727,140	TC/Art Unit :	2441
Applicant	:	Juergen Heymann *et al.*	Conf. No. :	5327
Filing Date	:	December 2, 2003	Examiner :	Bradford F. Fritz
Title	:	SESSION-RETURN ENABLING STATEFUL WEB APPLICATIONS		

CONTINUATION SHEET -- APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW SUMMARY

During the interview, the undersigned discussed distinctions between the aggregator token of Flurry *et al* and the instantly claimed External Session Identifier (ESID). Specifically, the ESID merely identifies a stored session state that is retained at the server. this allows a client browser to navigate back to a previously terminated session and provide the ESID for that session to the server. the server then retrieves the session state corresponding to the ESID from its session memory and at least partially restores the previously terminated state.

Examiner Fritz indicated that he understood the argued distinction, but that a further review of Flurry would be required to determine whether a client sending the aggregator token causes the server to retrieve a locally stored state. Examiner Fritz also noted that a further search of the prior art might be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 6, 2009

Michael D. Van Loy
Reg. No. 52,315

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Customer No. 64280
Tel.: 858/314-1559
Fax: 858/314-1501

4732291v.1